

University of Groningen

## Pseudepigraphy and a Scribal Sense of the Past in the Ancient Mediterranean

Popovic, Mladen

*Published in:*

Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Final author's version (accepted by publisher, after peer review)

*Publication date:*

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Popovic, M. (2017). Pseudepigraphy and a Scribal Sense of the Past in the Ancient Mediterranean: A Copy of the Book of the Words of the Vision of Amram. In A. Feldman, M. Cioatǎ, & C. Hempel (Eds.), *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke* (pp. 308-318). (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah; Vol. 119). Brill Academic Publisher.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

# Pseudepigraphy and a Scribal Sense of the Past in the Ancient Mediterranean: A Copy of the Book of the Words of the Vision of Amram

Mladen Popović, Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

## 1. Introduction

Why does the Aramaic text *Visions of Amram* open with an incipit that communicates to its intended reader that this is a copy (פרשגן) of the book (4Q543 1 a–c 1) instead of just saying that this is the book of the words of the vision of Amram?<sup>1</sup> A comparison between the longwinded opening statement of *Visions of Amram* with the tentative reconstruction of the opening of the so-called Pseudo-Ezekiel text may be instructive. The Hebrew text Pseudo-Ezekiel opens with what seems an introductory title: “[And these are the wor]ds of Ezekiel” (4Q385b 1).<sup>2</sup> What, if any, is the added meaning of “copy” in *Visions of Amram*?

Explanations for the use of the word “copy” in *Visions of Amram* were offered before, also drawing the concept of pseudepigraphy into the discussion. In this brief article I wish to add to some of these explanations by taking the use of “copy” in *Visions of Amram* as point of departure in order to rethink the production and transmission of ancient Jewish pseudepigraphic texts within the ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern contexts. Here I will focus on a so-called scribal sense of the past and investigate notions of original and copy. This contribution may add the notion of antiquarianism as a scribal sense of the past as an extra feature to take into consideration in recent discussions in the field about pseudepigraphy.

## 2. “Copy” (פרשגן) in the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls

The term פתשגן/פרשגן is a Persian loanword in Aramaic texts meaning “copy.” In targumim and Peshitta פרשגן is used to translate משנה in Deut 17:18 (Tg. Onq.) and Josh 8:32 (Tg. Ps.-J.) and in 1 Macc 11:31 and 12:7 Peshitta translates ἀντίγραφον with פרשגן. With regard to Deut 17:18, it is interesting to note that the term משנה is lacking in 11Q19 56:21.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The research for this article was carried out within the ERC Starting Grant of the European Research Council (EU Horizon 2020): The Hands that Wrote the Bible: Digital Palaeography and Scribal Culture of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HandsandBible #640497).

It is a pleasure and honour to dedicate this article to George Brooke. George’s great knowledge and mastery of the fields of ancient Judaism and early Christianity and beyond, his kindness and his wonderful sense of humour are beacons for younger scholars.

The initial idea for this brief article occurred to me in May 2016 during the presentation by Barry Hartog and Hanna Tervanotko on encyclopaedism and book culture in the Dirk Smilde Research Seminar in Groningen. I thank them and all other participants in the seminar for the initial discussion. I also thank Mirjam Bokhorst, Irene Peirano, Eibert Tigchelaar, Caroline Waerzeggers, Daniel Waller, and Jason Zurawski for their suggestions and discussion when developing further the initial idea.

<sup>2</sup> Devorah Dimant, DJD 30:73; Mladen Popović, “Prophet, Books and Texts: Ezekiel, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJS 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 227–51 (239). However, note that apart from 2 Sam 23:1 (which is already different because דברי האחרונים determines דברי) and perhaps Jer 29:1 (also a different kind of clause) there are no close correspondences to this reconstruction in 4Q385b 1. Reconstructions such as “From the book of the wor]ds of Ezekiel” or “This is a copy of the wor]ds of Ezekiel” may also be considered.

<sup>3</sup> See below for a brief discussion of משנה הכתב הזה in 3Q15 12:11. I thank Mirjam Bokhorst and Eibert Tigchelaar for calling my attention to these references.

The term פתשגן/פרשגן occurs seven times in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>4</sup> From the context of its use it becomes clear that the term could take on the added sense of signalling authoritative value. In Ezra פרשגן refers to a copy of a letter (in 4:11 and 5:6 אגרת is used, cf. *egertu* in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian, while in 4:23 and 7:11 another Persian loanword is used, נשתון). In Esther פתשגן refers to a copy of a written decree (in 3:14 and 8:13: פתשגן הכתב להנתן דת; and in 4:8: פתשגן כתב\_דתה). The narrative contexts in Ezra and Esther, which have a Persian setting, explain the use of the term “copy” (פתשגן/פרשגן): an original letter or decree was disseminated and read through multiple copies. Also, in the contexts of Ezra and Esther the reference is evidently to copies of communications by a person or a body of authority.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls the term פרשגן occurs at least four and maybe six times. In the Visions of Amram there is the longwinded opening statement in the incipit stating “Copy of the book of the words of the vision of Amram, son of [Qahat, son of Levi]” (פרשגן כתב מלי חזות עמרם ברן קהת בר לוי). In addition to 4Q543 1 a–c 1 and its parallel in 4Q545 1 a i 1, Daniel Machiela suggests that in the Genesis Apocryphon in 5:29 [רפ]ש[גן] preceded “the book of the words of Noah” (כתב מלי נוח).<sup>5</sup> The closest parallel to the incipit of Visions of Amram in the scrolls may be the reconstructed reference in 1QapGen 5:29, although the reconstruction is based on 4Q543.

In a manuscript of the Book of the Giants there is a reference to a copy of the second tablet of the letter (יא[גרתא]; cf. Ezra 4:11 and 5:6 above), in the dissemination of which Enoch functions as a scribe of interpretation (4Q203 8 3).<sup>6</sup> Thus, the reference is clearly to a copy of a communication by a person of authority, namely Enoch. And the same inference applies to the reconstructed text in 1QapGen 5:29, where the authoritative figure is Noah.

In 4Q465 1 3 there is another reference to a copy of a letter but the reference is reconstructed and very fragmentary (פר[שגן האגר]ת), and not of much use except as a parallel occurrence of the phrase in Ezra 4:11, 5:6, and 4Q203 8 3.<sup>7</sup> Finally, the reference to “copy” in 4Q550 6 7 is mostly reconstructed in the lacuna and not of much use for our purposes here.<sup>8</sup>

### 3. Explanations of the Use of פרשגן in Visions of Amram

Taking as point of reference the use of פתשגן/פרשגן in Ezra and Esther where it describes important and authoritative documents and decrees, Blake Jurgens argued that the use of פרשגן signified a manuscript’s permanent authoritative value, either as a legal decree or otherwise. Accordingly, in Visions of Amram the signalling function of פרשגן is to establish that the following copied content is inherited from the original words of Amram.<sup>9</sup> Adopting Moshe Bernstein’s differentiation between various

<sup>4</sup> Émile Puech, DJD 31:293. Henryk Drawnel, “The Initial Narrative of the *Visions of Amram* and its Literary Characteristics,” *RevQ* 24/96 (2010): 517–54 (527) and Blake A. Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the *Vision of Amram* (4Q543–547),” *JSP* 24 (2014): 3–42 (8–9) list six occurrences. See also Andrew B. Perrin, “Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipits in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 98–123 (104 and 113 n. 47).

<sup>5</sup> Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 42.

<sup>6</sup> See Loren Stuckenbruck, DJD 36:31–32.

<sup>7</sup> Erik Larson, DJD 36:395.

<sup>8</sup> Émile Puech, DJD 37:35–36.

<sup>9</sup> Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 8–9.

categories of pseudepigraphy,<sup>10</sup> Andrew Perrin considered Visions of Amram an example of authoritative pseudepigraphy.<sup>11</sup>

Regardless of what different modes of pseudepigraphy may be discerned in Visions of Amram,<sup>12</sup> both Jurgens and Perrin stressed the authoritative value attributed to the use of פִּרְשָׁן in Visions of Amram. The emphasis on the authoritative value of פִּרְשָׁן makes sense in light of our discussion in the preceding section on the use of פִּתְשָׁן/שָׁגוּפָר—in Ezra, Esther, the Book of Giants, and possibly the Genesis Apocryphon—as a reference to a copy of a communication by a person of authority.

Already in 1980 Eckhard von Nordheim drew attention to a possible parallel between Visions of Amram and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. He equated the use of ἀντίγραφον (“copy”) in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs with the use of פִּרְשָׁן in Visions of Amram.<sup>13</sup> Harm Hollander and Marinus de Jonge agreed with Von Nordheim’s observation and added that ἀντίγραφον λόγων is used in six of the Testaments.<sup>14</sup> Jörg Frey has also argued for close literary resemblances between the Visions of Amram and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, especially also in light of the corresponding use of the term “copy.”<sup>15</sup>

Here, I will not go into the complex discussions about the applicability of the terms testamentary literature or testamentary discourse to a number of mostly Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, their transmission, and their possible relations to later testamentary discourse such as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. As far as I can see no explicit acknowledgements in scholarly literature have been made as to the uniqueness in ancient Greek texts of the phrase ἀντίγραφον λόγων in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This is not to argue for a direct connection between Visions of Amram and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. But, absent extant evidence for the exact beginning of, for example, the Aramaic Levi Document, there may have been an Aramaic precursor for the phrase ἀντίγραφον λόγων in earlier traditions.

Émile Puech interpreted a phrase in another manuscript of Visions of Amram as to take up the title from 4Q543: “Then I awoke from the sleep of my eyes and [I] wrote down the vision” (4Q547 9 8).<sup>16</sup> Henryk Drawnel followed Puech in this and added: “the first person singular narration present in the whole composition suggests

---

<sup>10</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, with the collaboration of Avital Pinnick, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–26.

<sup>11</sup> Perrin, “Capturing the Voices,” 111.

<sup>12</sup> See Eibert Tigchelaar, “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. Eibert Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 1–18 (6).

<sup>13</sup> Eckhard von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten: I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, ALGHJ 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 117.

<sup>14</sup> Harm W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 30.

<sup>15</sup> Jörg Frey, “On the Origins of the Genre of the ‘Literary Testament’: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 345–75 (359–61, 367–70).

<sup>16</sup> Puech, DJD 31:390.

that all the content of the work, except for its introductory narrative framework . . . comes directly from the patriarch.”<sup>17</sup> Perrin took this idea further when he focused on first person accounts in Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls. He took the incipit as a paratextual feature for reasons of pseudepigraphy. Perrin argued that the use of “copy” (פרשגן) in Visions of Amram functions as an internal title and reference within the narrative: “presenting the work as a ‘copy’ indicates that the text before the reader derived from an ‘original’ inscribed within the narrative.”<sup>18</sup>

There seem to be two further considerations that have not yet been raised with regard to the suggestion that the use of פרשגן functions as a text-internal narrative device in Visions of Amram. First, 4Q547 9 8 refers here in the first place to the immediately preceding vision from which Amram is said to have awoken. Given the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts it is far from certain that the reference in the incipit “is book-ended by the production of a purported document at the hand of Amram near the end of the storyline.”<sup>19</sup> Of course, one might suggest that at least one attestation of Amram putting his vision to writing suffices to assume that the incipit is referring to this particular writing activity. But it is not necessary to limit the sense of פרשגן to the function of an internal title and reference within the narrative, as may be argued by taking the following consideration into account. Second, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs have no reference to the patriarchs writing down their words. On the contrary, when the patriarchs finish giving their instructions or speaking their commandments they die. But all testamentary sections are introduced by referring to the text that follows as a “copy” (ἀντίγραφον). In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarch at least the use of ἀντίγραφον does not function as a text-internal narrative device. There is, therefore, from a literary perspective no need to assume that the use of פרשגן in Visions of Amram is limited to a function of an internal title and reference within the narrative.

However, the paramount importance of writing in Visions of Amram and other such texts is evident. On the one hand, there is the farewell setting of the day of dying in testamentary discourses. On the other hand, emphasis is put on the transmission of instructions and commandments, and on the writing down of (revealed) knowledge.<sup>20</sup> The Aramaic text Testament of Qahat shows clear evidence of a patriarch referring to his own writings. In 4Q542 1 ii 9–13 Qahat speaks to his son Amram, and to his sons, talking about “all my writings (כול כתבי) as a witness” (4Q542 1 ii 12).<sup>21</sup> The emphasis on the importance of main scribal activities such as reading and writing invites further investigation into certain aspects of the scribal culture behind these manuscripts, focusing on copying as a scribal activity within the ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern contexts.

#### 4. Original and Copy

<sup>17</sup> Drawnel, “The Initial Narrative,” 527.

<sup>18</sup> Perrin, “Capturing the Voices,” 109–11, 122. See also Andrew B. Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*, JAJ 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 111.

<sup>19</sup> Perrin, “Capturing the Voices,” 111.

<sup>20</sup> In addition to Drawnel, “The Initial Narrative” and Perrin, “Capturing the Voices,” see also, e.g., Frances Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*, JSJS 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 139–47.

<sup>21</sup> See also Puech, DJD 31:279; Drawnel, “The Initial Narrative,” 527.

The reference to “copy” in the incipit of Visions of Amram brings to mind the Babylonian and Assyrian colophons that refer to the text on the tablet being a copy from an original.<sup>22</sup> Texts were copied for various reasons and in various contexts. They could be copied for the moment as an exercise in an educational context, or for long-term storage.<sup>23</sup> Copying tablets was presumably a lower-rank function.<sup>24</sup>

Differentiating between different levels of cuneiform literacy—functional, technical, and scholarly—colophons played an important role within the realm of scholarly literacy as they appear in copies of traditional texts.<sup>25</sup> In addition to information about the composition (e.g., its title and tablet number and/or number of lines), the colophons give information on the scribe (e.g., his name and position) and his sources (e.g., the origin of the tablet). The importance of the colophon is it being “the place where the scribe identified himself and established the link between the scribal tradition and his person as a scribe.”<sup>26</sup> In some instances people considered the colophon itself to be part of the text and it was thus copied and preserved by later scribes, which was the case with one of the most famous scribal colophons that describes the editorial work of an eleventh-century scholar from Borsippa named Esagil-kīn-apli.<sup>27</sup>

In addition to copies made by routine copying of relatively recent “Vorlagen” in the normal course of scribal activity, there is also ample evidence for copying of originals that were retrieved after a long interval.<sup>28</sup> This instance of scribal archaeology or antiquarianism applies mainly to inscriptions, but there are also examples of literary texts: “If kings devoted themselves to recovering monumental relics, the scribes spent their lives copying and studying earlier texts. Statues and reliefs were collected in museums of sorts, and earlier texts were copied and gathered at specific locations, such as the famous library of Assurbanipal in Nineveh.”<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Hermann Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, AOAT 2 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968).

<sup>23</sup> William W. Hallo, “Another Ancient Antiquary,” in *If a Man Builds a Joyful House: Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty*, ed. Ann K. Guinan et al., CM 31 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 187–96 (188); Martin Worthington, *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*, Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 21, 28–32. See also Alexa Bartelmus and Jon Taylor, “Collecting and Connecting History: Nabonidus and the Kassite Rebuilding of E(ul)maš of (Ištar)-Annunītu in Sippar-Annunītu,” *JCS* 66 (2014): 113–28 (121).

<sup>24</sup> Worthington, *Principles of Akkadian*, 29; Bartelmus and Taylor, “Collecting and Connecting History,” 121. Also in the Roman world the task of laboriously reproducing a manuscript was done by trained persons of low status; see Myles McDonnell, “Writing, Copying, and Autograph Manuscripts in Ancient Rome,” *CQ* (1996): 469–91 (477).

<sup>25</sup> Niek Veldhuis, “Levels of Literacy,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, ed. Karen Radner and Eleanor Robson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 68–89 (81–82).

<sup>26</sup> Veldhuis, “Levels of Literacy,” 81.

<sup>27</sup> Matthew Rutz, *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection*, AMD 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 23–24.

<sup>28</sup> Hallo, “Another Ancient Antiquary,” 189.

<sup>29</sup> Gonzalo Rubio, “Scribal Secrets and Antiquarian Nostalgia: Tradition and Scholarship in Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *Reconstructing a Distant Past: Ancient Near Eastern Essays in Tribute to Jorge R. Silva Castillo*, ed. Diego A. Barreyra Fracaroli and Gregorio del Olmo Lete (Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 2009), 155–82 (160). See also Bartelmus and Taylor, “Collecting and Connecting History,” 118, 126; Paul-Alain Beaulieu, “Mesopotamian Antiquarianism from Sumer to Babylon,” in *World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Alain Schnapp (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute: 2013), 121–39 (132–33).

By the Neo-Babylonian period, to judge by the colophons, an antiquarian interest in their past was shared by Babylonian kings, scribes, priests, and private citizens.<sup>30</sup> A characteristic feature of these copying activities is the occurrence of archaic and archaizing palaeography. When copying earlier inscriptions scribes faithfully preserved ancient or archaic writing styles, frequently adding a colophon in contemporary cuneiform.<sup>31</sup> Thanks to the unusual formatting and script, copies of ancient inscriptions can usually be easily distinguished.<sup>32</sup> The study of the archaizing script formed part of the Neo-Babylonian scribal curriculum until the Seleucid period.<sup>33</sup> The use of palaeography in these texts connected authority, power, and scholarship and in doing so these texts and colophons represented the authority of the past.<sup>34</sup> Thus, archaic and archaizing palaeography in texts and colophons also reveal an antiquarian proclivity to connect with the distant past, especially the antediluvian past.<sup>35</sup> Because of accidental finds of archaic tablets perhaps some Mesopotamian scholars believed that, as Paul-Alain Beaulieu suggests, they had found those “inscriptions from before the flood” mentioned by Ashurbanipal.”<sup>36</sup>

In light of the discussion about the concept of pseudepigraphy in ancient Judaism it may be instructive to consider briefly the so-called Cruciform Monument, which “highlights the ability of Babylonian scribes and scholars in the sixth century BCE to undertake methodical historical research . . . to create a convincing forgery.”<sup>37</sup> The Cruciform Monument may indeed have been “triggered by and predicated on Nabonidus’ deep archaeological and historical concerns,” but to understand it as “nothing but a symptom of the degree of antiquarian obsession Nabonidus had reached”<sup>38</sup> seems to exclude also taking seriously a genuine concern with the past on the part of the expert scribes who created this text.<sup>39</sup> Thus, the text of the Cruciform Monument need not be set apart as a forgery from other instances of constructions of the past in cuneiform texts.<sup>40</sup>

Recent research on the concept of pseudepigraphy in ancient Judaism has made clear the need not to understand these texts as frauds or wrongfully attributed texts. Instead these texts should be studied as proper contributions to ongoing

<sup>30</sup> Hallo, “Another Ancient Antiquary,” 192.

<sup>31</sup> Veldhuis, “Levels of Literacy,” 81.

<sup>32</sup> Bartelmus and Taylor, “Collecting and Connecting History,” 120.

<sup>33</sup> Beaulieu, “Mesopotamian Antiquarianism,” 131.

<sup>34</sup> Veldhuis, “Levels of Literacy,” 82.

<sup>35</sup> Stefan M. Maul, “Gottesdienst im Sonnenheiligtum zu Sippar,” in *Munuscula Mesopotamica: Festschrift für Johannes Renger*, ed. Barbara Böck, Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, and Thomas Richter, AOAT 267 (Münster: Ugarit, 1999), 285–316 (312–13); Matthew T. Rutz, “Archaizing Scripts in Emar and the Diviner Šaggar-abu,” *UF* 38 (2006): 593–616 (610).

<sup>36</sup> Beaulieu, “Mesopotamian Antiquarianism,” 131–32.

<sup>37</sup> Beaulieu, “Mesopotamian Antiquarianism,” 130. See also Bartelmus and Taylor, “Collecting and Connecting History,” 122.

<sup>38</sup> Rubio, “Scribal Secrets,” 165.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Beaulieu, “Mesopotamian Antiquarianism,” 130.

<sup>40</sup> In Classics discussion of ancient frauds has evolved into a re-appreciation of pseudepigraphic texts. See, e.g., James E. G. Zetzel, “Emendavi ad Tironem: Some Notes on Scholarship in the Second Century A. D.,” *HSCP* 77 (1973): 225–43; McDonnell, “Writing, Copying, and Autograph Manuscripts”; Niklas Holzberg, ed., *Die Appendix Vergiliana: Pseudepigraphen im literarischen Kontext*, Classica Monacensia 30 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2005); Irene Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); eadem, “Authenticity as an Aesthetic Concept: Ancient and Modern Reflections,” in *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity*, ed. Ineke Sluiter and Ralph M. Rosen, Mnemosyne, Supplements 350 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 215–42.

debates and discourses tied to these writers' and their audiences' concern with their past and their efforts in establishing an ethics through the imitation or emulation of an authoritative and exemplary figure.<sup>41</sup> The past was accessible through the texts created and copied by these writers and scribes.

### 5. A Scribal Sense of the Past

The relation between copy and original in the cuneiform evidence is obviously very different from the evidence that is available in the extant ancient Jewish manuscripts. If the incipit in Visions of Amram is at all comparable to the cuneiform colophons it is evident that the cuneiform colophons refer to actual copyists, actual copies, and actual originals in time and place, whereas in Visions of Amram the reference to a copy of the book of the words of the vision of Amram exists only within a literary realm.<sup>42</sup> There was no actual original or immediate *Vorlage* of which the copies as they are extant in 4Q543 and in 4Q545 were a copy.

If the colophon-turned-part-of-the-text describing the editorial work of Esagil-kīn-apli referred to above is something to go on this may support a comparison between the incipit of Visions of Amram and cuneiform colophons. The comparison between cuneiform and Jewish texts is revealing of what I would like to call a scribal sense of the past in the latter texts. In Visions of Amram and also in other ancient Jewish texts, for example 1 Enoch, there is an evident tendency to harken back to the distant past, be it pre-Mosaic or antediluvian. Scribes evidently played an important role in these constant engagements with the past.

The scribal archaeology evident in cuneiform evidence seems absent in ancient Judaism. However, in a literary realm there is evidence for the awareness of the existence of ancient inscriptions. The function of writing and books is important in Jubilees.<sup>43</sup> In Jub. 8:1–4 the text states that Cainan was taught to read and write by his father Arpachshad, that Cainan found a writing which the ancestors engraved on stone, and that he read it, transcribed it, and copied it down. Again, for ancient Judaism we have no historical evidence for actual copies that are the result of such scribal archaeology, but there is at least evidence in a literary setting that shows a scribal sense of the past that is similar to what is found in cuneiform evidence.

Given the paramount importance of writing in Visions of Amram and other such texts, the reference to a “copy” may indeed function as a paratextual device of pseudepigraphy, but also, I suggest, as an explicit acknowledgement of the scribal tradition in which these manuscripts stood and were produced and transmitted. As in cuneiform traditions, ancient Jewish scribes may indeed have had a sense of the past different from that as expressed by the chain of mediation in a literary realm.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> See, e.g., Tigchelaar, “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha”; Hindy Najman, “The Exemplary Protagonist: The Case of 4 Ezra,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. Eibert Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 261–87.

<sup>42</sup> Also, we do not find a similar use of archaic or archaizing palaeography in the manuscripts from the Judaean Desert, although perhaps one may suggest that the writing of the divine name in some of the scrolls might reflect a similar such use in order to represent the authority of the past by connecting authority, power, and scholarship.

<sup>43</sup> See, e.g., Eibert Tigchelaar, “Jubilees and 1 Enoch and the Issue of Transmission of Knowledge,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 99–101.

<sup>44</sup> See, e.g., Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*, TSAJ 63 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 90; Tigchelaar, “Jubilees and 1 Enoch.”



The use of the term “copy” (פרשגן) in Visions of Amram should therefore, in addition to signalling authoritative value and being a paratextual device of pseudepigraphy, also be understood as a “normal” scribal reference, a matter of fact observation, as in cuneiform colophons. This suggestion is further corroborated by the reference in the Copper Scroll to another copy of the text. The text refers in 3Q15 12:10–13 to a copy of this document or inventory list that is hidden at a particular place.<sup>45</sup> The use of משנה in the Copper Scroll (3Q15 12:11) corresponds to פרשגן in Visions of Amram. It is a normal scribal reference to a copy of an original.

The endurance of their writings was what ancient Jewish scribes wished for: “Would that someone would write these words of mine in a writing that would not wear out, and th[is] utterance of mine [keep in a scroll that will never] pass away” (4Q536 2 ii 12–13). Through the constant copying of manuscripts these scribes ensured the endurance of their ancestral writings, whether they contained ancient or more recent contributions to ongoing debates and discourses. I hope to have added with this brief article the notion of antiquarianism as a scribal sense of the past as an extra feature to be taken into consideration in future studies on the concept of pseudepigraphy in ancient Judaism in its ancient Mediterranean context.

---

<sup>45</sup> See, e.g., Daniel Brizemeure, Noël Lacoudre, and Émile Puech, *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumrân (3Q15): Expertise – Restauration – Epigraphie* STDJ 55/1 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 206. The supporting evidence from the Copper Scroll is also apt in light of George Brooke’s special attachment to this text which is evident in various ways, see, e.g., George Brooke and Philip R. Davies, eds., *Copper Scroll Studies*, JSPS 40 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002; repr. London: T&T Clark, 2004).